UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,349	09/18/2000	Mark A. Harper	10003223-1	4554

22879   7590   12/01/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
THEIN, MARIA TERESA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 August 2004*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 22-33* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 22-33* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's "Amendment D" filed on August 30, 2004 has been

considered.

Applicant's response by virtue of amendment to claim 23 has overcome

the Examiner's rejection of such claim under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claims 8 and 11 are amended. New claims 29-33 are added. Claim 21 is

cancelled. Claims 1-20 and 22- 33 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "prior to deployment" lacks

antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 6-7, and 24-25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,108,099 to Ohtani in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,446 to Hatakeyama et al.

Regarding claim 1, Ohtani discloses a method of programming a memory unit and obtaining consumable supplies in a hard copy output engine comprising:

- determining an electronic address for a consumables supplier (E-mail address which is an address of a dealer that the reordering of paper, col. 5, lines 40-41);

- programming the electronic address into the memory (memory stores the ordering address to order the consumable goods, col. 8, lines 39-31);

However, Ohtani does not explicitly disclose the non-volatile memory. Ohtani discloses the system controller stores the inputted E-mail address in the parameter memory (col. 5, lines 23-25). The non-volatile memory, as defined in Random House Computer & Internet Dictionary (1999), is the types of memory that retained their contents when power is turned off. To one of ordinarily skilled in the art, one wants to maintain an address or information in a memory when the power is shut off. In addition, one tends to want a memory that does not lose its data when the power is turned off. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Ohtani, to include the non-volatile memory for the purpose of maintaining or retaining the address.

Furthermore, Ohtani does not disclose the geographical area within which

the engine is to be deployed. Ohtani discloses an image forming apparatus used

in facsimile machines, copy machines, printers that are connected to a

communication network like a LAN and have a function for sending an electronic

mail to a destination terminal (col. 2, lines 57-62). Furthermore, Ohtani discloses

the network terminals including the facsimile machine 20 and personal computer

30 send E-mail to another terminal connected to the LAN 50 or a destination

client terminal connected to a wide-area network like the Internet, the sent E-mail

is first stored in the server 40 and is then sent to an addressed terminal (col. 3,

lines 19-25). Hatakeyama, on the other hand, teaches the geographical area

within which the product is to be deployed (facility locating program determines

the location where products are to be set up).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify the method of Ohtani, to include the

geographical area, as taught by Hatakeyama, in order to provide an accurate

location of an area where set-up and expansion is needed and evaluated

(Hatakeyama col. 1, line 67 –col. 2, line 1).

Regarding claims 4 and 6-7, Ohtani discloses product descriptors for

consumable supplies associated with the hard copy output engine (see at least

col. 2, lines 57-62; col. 3, lines 19-25); the hard copy output engine is chosen

from the group consisting of: facsimile machines, photocopiers and printers (see

at least col. 2, lines 58-59); and a supplier chosen from the group consisting of:

an original equipment manufacturer, a reseller, or a supplier of office supplies

including hard copy output engine consumables (see at least Figure 4; col. 5,
lines 33-48).

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Ohtani and Hatekayma discloses
substantially the claimed invention, however, it does not disclose the
determinings and programming are performed prior to deployment of the hard
copy output engine in a user environment. It was known at the time of the
invention that merely reciting an order of the steps of a method claim which
accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art,
Altiris Inc. v. Symantec Corp., 65 USPQ2d 1865. For example, simply
performing the determining and programming prior to the deployment gives you
the same expectation which is already disclosed by the combination of Ohtani
and Hatekayma. Moreover, applicant has not persuasively demonstrated that
the recited order of steps is critical that the skilled artisan would have found
suitable for the purpose taught by the combination. Therefore, it would have
been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to
provide any way to determine and program in the method taught by the
combination because the particular way to determine and program does not
patently distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 25, Ohtani disclose the programming into the memory
resident within the hard copy output engine (see at least col. 3, lines 63-66; col.
5, lines 14-17).

Claims 8, 11-12, 14-15, 17, 19, 22, 27, and 29-31 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,108,099 to

Ohtani in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,711 to Sekizawa.

Regarding claim 8, Ohtani discloses a method of obtaining consumable

supplies for a hard copy:

- the extracting of an electronic address for a vendor (dealer) from a

  memory (E-mail address indicating where to order the paper is stored and

  this is an address of a dealer that handles the reordering paper);

- initiating communication with the vendor using the electronic address (see

  at least col. 5, lines 19-25; col. 6, lines 34-36; col. 7, lines 24-30)

- wherein initiating comprises directly initiating communication with the

  vendor from the hard copy output engine (E-mail address indicating where

  to order the paper and this is an address of a dealer that handles the

  reordering of paper)

However, Ohtani does not explicitly disclose the non-volatile memory.

Ohtani discloses the system controller stores the inputted E-mail address in the

parameter memory (col. 5, lines 23-25). The non-volatile memory, as defined in

Random House Computer & Internet Dictionary (1999), is the types of memory

that retained their contents when power is turned off. To one of ordinarily skilled

in the art, one wants to maintain an address or information in a memory when the

power is shut off. In addition, one tends to want a memory that does not lose its

data when the power is turned off. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the

method of Ohtani, to include the non-volatile memory for the purpose of maintaining or retaining the address.

Furthermore, Ohtani does not disclose determining that an amount of consumable for the hard copy output engine is less than a threshold amount. Ohtani determines when the toner and paper is out (see at least col. 6, lines 10-24). Sekizawa, on the other hand, teaches the determining that an amount of consumable for the hard copy output engine is less than a threshold amount (see at least col. 9, lines 44-57; col. 10, lines 3-8; col. 15, lines 22-32; col. 28, lines 44-67; col. 34, lines 23-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Ohtani, to include determining that an amount of consumable for the hard copy output engine is less than a threshold amount, as taught by Sekizawa, so an operator can easily keep track of the consumable consumption tendency for each machines based on the predicted statistics (Sekizawa col. 9, lines 18-21). Thus, the consumable article can be prevented from running out (Sekizawa col. 9, lines 29-30).

Regarding claims 11-12, and 17, Sekizawa discloses a predetermined quantity of the consumable determined to be present in an amount less than the threshold amount (see at least col. 19, lines 15-35; col. 46, lines 7-31); and the determining comprises determining using processing circuitry in response to a sensor in the hard copy output engine sensing that an amount of the consumable is less than the threshold amount (see at least col. 19, lines 22-27; col. 33, lines 31-35; col. 34; col. 34, lines 22-55).

Regarding claims 14 and 19, Ohtani discloses the hard copy output

engine is chosen from the group consisting of: facsimile machines, photocopiers

and printers (see at least col. 2, lines 58-59).

Regarding claim 15, Ohtani discloses a computer implemented control

system for a hard copy output engine, the system comprising:

- memory included in the hard copy output engine configured to store data

   representing an electronic address for a supplier of consumables see at

   least Figures 4-6; col. 2, lines 1-12; col. 5, lines 14-25; col. 6, lines 10-20;

   col. 5, lines 33-48; col. 8, lines 28-32; col. 9, lines 29-33); and

- processing circuitry configured (see at least col. 4, lines 45-52; col. 3, lines

   49-56) to:

   - extract the electronic address from the memory (see at least

      Figures 4-6; col. 2, lines 1-12; col. 5, lines 14-25; col. 6, lines 10-

      20); and

   - initiate communication with the supplier using the electronic

      address (see at least col. 5, lines 19-25; col. 6, lines 34-36; col. 7,

      lines 24-30).

However, Ohtani does not explicitly disclose the non-volatile memory.

Ohtani discloses the system controller stores the inputted E-mail address in the

parameter memory (col. 5, lines 23-25). The non-volatile memory, as defined in

Random House Computer & Internet Dictionary (1999), is the types of memory

that retained their contents when power is turned off. To one of ordinarily skilled

in the art, one wants to maintain an address or information in a memory when the

power is shut off. In addition, one tends to want a memory that does not lose its data when the power is turned off. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Ohtani, to include the non-volatile memory for the purpose of maintaining or retaining the address.

Furthermore, Ohtani does not disclose determining that an amount of consumable for the hard copy output engine is less than a threshold amount. Ohtani determines when the toner and paper is out (see at least col. 6, lines 10-24). Sekizawa, on the other hand, teaches the determining that an amount of consumable for the hard copy output engine is less than a threshold amount (see at least col. 9, lines 44-57; col. 10, lines 3-8; col. 15, lines 22-32; col. 28, lines 44-67; col. 34, lines 23-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Ohtani, to include determining that an amount of consumable for the hard copy output engine is less than a threshold amount, as taught by Sekizawa, so an operator can easily keep track of the consumable consumption tendency for each machines based on the predicted statistics (Sekizawa col. 9, lines 18-21). Thus, the consumable article can be prevented from running out (Sekizawa col. 9, lines 29-30).

Regarding claim 22, Ohtani discloses the process circuitry (see at least col. 4, lines 45-52; col. 3, lines 49-56).

Regarding claim 27, the combination discloses substantially the claimed invention, however, the combination does not disclose the determinings and

programming are performed prior to deployment of the hard copy output engine

in a user environment. It was known at the time of the invention that merely

reciting an order of the steps of a method claim which accomplishes the same

result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art, *Altiris Inc. v. Symantec*

Corp., 65 USPQ2d 1865. For example, simply performing the determining and

programming prior to the deployment gives you the same expectation which is

already disclosed by the combination. Moreover, applicant has not persuasively

demonstrated that the recited order of steps is critical that the skilled artisan

would have found suitable for the purpose taught by the combination. Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to provide any way to determine and program in the method taught by

the combination because the particular way to determine and program does not

patently distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 29-31, Ohtani discloses communicating an electronic

message from the hard copy output engine to the vendor directly to supplier (col.

5, lines 39-48).

Claims 23, 28, 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,108,099 to Ohtani in view of U.S. Patent

No. 5,805,446 to Hatakeyama et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No.

6,430,711 to Sekizawa.

Regarding claim 23, Ohtani discloses a method of obtaining consumable

supplies for a hard copy output engine comprising:

- determining an electronic address for a consumables supplier (E-mail address which is an address of a dealer for the reordering of paper, col. 5, lines 40-41);

- programming the electronic address into the memory (memory stores the ordering address to order the consumable goods, col. 8, lines 39-31); and

- proactively initiating communication with the consumables supplier from the hard copy output engine and using the stored electronic address (col. 5, lines 39-48).

However, Ohtani does not explicitly disclose the non-volatile memory. Ohtani discloses the system controller stores the inputted E-mail address in the parameter memory (col. 5, lines 23-25). The non-volatile memory, as defined in Random House Computer & Internet Dictionary (1999), is the types of memory that retained their contents when power is turned off. To one of ordinarily skilled in the art, one wants to maintain an address or information in a memory when the power is shut off. In addition, one tends to want a memory that does not lose its data when the power is turned off. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Ohtani, to include the non-volatile memory for the purpose of maintaining or retaining the address.

Furthermore, Ohtani does not disclose the geographical area within which the hard copy output engine is to be deployed. Ohtani discloses an image forming apparatus used in facsimile machines, copy machines, printers that are connected to a communication network like a LAN and have a function for

sending an electronic mail to a destination terminal (col. 2, lines 57-62).

Furthermore, Ohtani discloses the network terminals including the facsimile

machine 20 and personal computer 30 send E-mail to another terminal

connected to the LAN 50 or a destination client terminal connected to a wide-

area network like the Internet, the sent E-mail is first stored in the server 40 and

is then sent to an addressed terminal (col. 3, lines 19-25). Hatakeyama, on the

other hand, teaches the geographical area within which the product is to be

deployed (facility locating program determines the location where products are to

be set up).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify the method of Ohtani, to include the

geographical area, as taught by Hatakeyama, in order to provide an accurate

location of an area where set-up and expansion is needed and evaluated

(Hatakeyama col. 1, line 67 –col. 2, line 1).

Moreover, the combination of Ohtani and Hatakeyama does not disclose

determining that an amount of consumable for the hard copy output engine is

less than a threshold amount. The combination discloses the determination

when the toner and paper is out (Ohtani see at least col. 6, lines 10-24).

Sekizawa, on the other hand, teaches the determining that an amount of

consumable for the hard copy output engine is less than a threshold amount (see

at least col. 9, lines 44-57; col. 10, lines 3-8; col. 15, lines 22-32; col. 28, lines 44-

67; col. 34, lines 23-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination, to include determining that an amount of consumable for the hard copy output engine is less than a threshold amount, as taught by Sekizawa, so an operator can easily keep track of the consumable consumption tendency for each machines based on the predicted statistics (Sekizawa col. 9, lines 18-21). Thus, the consumable article can be prevented from running out (Sekizawa col. 9, lines 29-30).

Regarding claim 28, the combination discloses substantially the claimed invention, however, the combination does not disclose the determinings and programming are performed prior to deployment of the hard copy output engine in a user environment. It was known at the time of the invention that merely reciting an order of the steps of a method claim which accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art, *Altiris Inc. v. Symantec Corp.*, 65 USPQ2d 1865. For example, simply performing the determining and programming prior to the deployment gives you the same expectation which is already disclosed by the combination. Moreover, applicant has not persuasively demonstrated that the recited order of steps is critical that the skilled artisan would have found suitable for the purpose taught by the combination. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide any way to determine and program in the method taught by the combination because the particular way to determine and program does not patently distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 32-33, Ohtani discloses communicating an electronic

message from the hard copy output engine to the vendor directly to supplier (col.

5, lines 39-48).

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Ohtani and Sekizawa and in further in view of Hatakeyama.

Regarding claim 26, the combination of Ohtani and Sekizawa discloses

substantially the claimed invention, specifically, the determining of the electronic

address corresponding to the hard copy output engine (Ohtani Figures 4-6).

However, the combination does not disclose the geographical area within which

the hard copy output engine is to be deployed. The combination discloses an

image forming apparatus used in facsimile machines, copy machines, printers

that are connected to a communication network like a LAN and have a function

for sending an electronic mail to a destination terminal (Ohtani col. 2, lines 57-

62). Furthermore, the combination discloses the network terminals including the

facsimile machine 20 and personal computer 30 send E-mail to another terminal

connected to the LAN 50 or a destination client terminal connected to a wide-

area network like the Internet, the sent E-mail is first stored in the server 40 and

is then sent to an addressed terminal (Ohtani col. 3, lines 19-25). Hatakeyama,

on the other hand, teaches the geographical area within which the product is to

be deployed (facility locating program determines the location where products

are to be set up).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify the combination, to include the geographical

area, as taught by Hatakeyama, in order to provide an accurate location of an

area where set-up and expansion is needed and evaluated (Hatakeyama col. 1,

line 67 –col. 2, line 1).

Furthermore, the combination does not disclose the determinings and

programming are performed prior to deployment of the hard copy output engine

in a user environment. It was known at the time of the invention that merely

reciting an order of the steps of a method claim which accomplishes the same

result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art, *Altiris Inc. v. Symantec*

Corp., 65 USPQ2d 1865. For example, simply performing the determining and

programming prior to the deployment gives you the same expectation which is

already disclosed by the combination. Moreover, applicant has not persuasively

demonstrated that the recited order of steps is critical that the skilled artisan

would have found suitable for the purpose taught by the combination. Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to provide any way to determine and program in the method taught by

the combination because the particular way to determine and program does not

patently distinguish the claimed invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ohtani and Hatakeyama as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of

U.S. Patent No. 6,272,472 to Danneels et al. Ohtani and Hatakeyama

substantially disclose the claimed invention, however, it does not disclose the

reseller. The combination discloses the dealer (Ohtani col. 5, lines 39-43).

Danneels, on the other hand, teaches the reseller (see at least abstract,

summary). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to modify the combination of Ohtani and

Hatakeyama, to include the reseller, to provide a convenient way for a purchase

to order the product (Danneels col. 3, lines 59-61).

Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ohtani and Hatakeyama as applied to claims 1 above,

and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,581 to Perkowski.

Regarding claim 2, Ohtani and Hatakeyama substantially discloses the

claimed invention, however, the combination does not disclose the extracting of

an electronic address, which comprises the extracting a universal resource

locator. The combination discloses an ordering address to order the

consumable goods (Ohtani col. 8, lines 28-32). Perkowski, on the other hand,

teaches the extracting of an electronic address which comprises the extracting of

a universal resource locator (see at least col. 45, line 45 – col. 46, line 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify the combination of Ohtani and Hatakeyama, to

include the universal resource locator, in order to find the web home page of the

vendor or supplier (Perkowski col. 46, lines 19-21).

Regarding claim 5, Ohtani and Hatakeyama substantially discloses the

claimed invention, however, the combination does not disclose the determining of

the electronic address of the supplier is obsolete; determining a revised

electronic address for the supplier; and re-programming the memory with the

revised electronic address to replace the obsolete electronic address.

Perkowski, on the other hand, teaches the determining of the electronic address of the supplier is obsolete; determining a revised electronic address for the supplier; and re-programming the memory wit the revised electronic address to replace the obsolete electronic address (see at least col. 46, lines 18-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination of Ohtani and Hatakeyama, to include the determining of the electronic address of the supplier is obsolete; determining a revised electronic address for the supplier; and re-programming the memory wit the revised electronic address to replace the obsolete electronic address, in order to determine and update whether a particular supplier has a registered address on the Internet (Perkowski col. 46, lines 30-36).

Claims 9-10, 13, 16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohtani and Sekizawa as applied to claims 8 and 15, and 15 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,581 to Perkowski.

Regarding claims 9-10, 16, and 20, Ohtani and Sekizawa substantially discloses the claimed invention, however, it does not disclose the extracting of an electronic address, which comprises the extracting a universal resource locator. The combination discloses an ordering address to order the consumable goods (Ohtani col. 8, lines 28-32). Perkowski, on the other hand, teaches the extracting of an electronic address which comprises the extracting of a universal resource locator (see at least col. 45, line 45 – col. 46, line 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to

modify the combination of Ohtani and Sekizawa, to include the universal

resource locator, in order to find the web home page of the vendor or supplier

(Perkowski col. 46, lines 19-21).

Regarding claims 13 and 18, Ohtani and Sekizawa substantially discloses

the claimed invention, however, it does not disclose the servlet. The combination

disclose the global Internet (see Sekizawa col. 43, lines 35-38). Perkowski, on

the other hand, teaches the servlet (see at least col. 14, lines 5-50; and Figures

2B1, 2B2 and 2B3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination of Ohtani and

Sekizawa, to include the servlet, in order to provide a Web server environment

and can fulfill multiple task (Perkowski col. 48, lines 38-44).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Marissa Thein whose telephone number is

703-305-5246. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on 703-308-5183. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

mtot
November 29, 2004

MICHAEL CUFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER